

REFORMED JOURNAL

S.F.T.S.
The LIBRARY

Volume II — No. 4

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

April, 1952

SYNOD IN PROSPECT

WHAT'S coming up at Synod?

Those who take an interest in the Church are in the habit of asking this question when they get together, — especially at this time of the year.

The Synod of the Christian Reformed Church meets in June. But preparations for the assembling of Synod and for the discharge of its task are already in process. The various Classes have no doubt by this time elected their delegates. The Stated Clerk has gathered the reports and overtures which were to meet the March 15 copy deadline, has hustled them off to the printer, and is no doubt trying to push the printer to get the *Agenda* off the press and in the mail with due haste.

What's coming up at Synod?

No one really knows, except the Stated Clerk, and no one will know until the *Agenda* comes off the press.

But there are some things we can gather from the *Acts* of the last Synod, from Classical overtures and digests of Synodical reports that appear in our Church papers, and from reports that make their way through from various parts of the country. And it does help some, even if all the material for study is not yet available, to know what's coming up at Synod.

The Divorce Problem

THE divorce problem was put on the *Agenda* for 1952 by the Synod of 1951. The last Synod received the Study Committee Report for information, commended it to the churches for study, and referred decision on the matter to the Synod of 1952.

There is no matter before the Church on which Synod could be more ready to act. There is no question before our Church which has received as much study and discussion.

The Committee now reporting was appointed in 1948. Its virtually unanimous recommendation was presented in 1951. The churches themselves have had this report and recommendation in their hands since the appearance of the 1951 *Acts*. We have been served by numerous Study Committees from 1914 to the present. We have been served with the advice of the Gereformeerde Kerken and the South African Church, and have been able to profit by the thorough studies of Professor John Murray of Westminster Seminary.

Perhaps the Synod of 1952 will at last be able to arrive at a definitive decision, conformable to Holy Scripture, consonant with the Church's calling in the face of the needs of our day, and fruitful for the Church's discharge of

her sanctifying and disciplining ministry.

Particular Synods

THE Committee on Particular Synods, appointed in 1950, deserves particular praise.

Soon after receiving its mandate it made a public appeal for public expression of judgment on the matter committed to it. It attempted to carry on its study in close contact with the thinking of the Church.

The Committee submitted a clearly defined report and recommendation well in advance of the meeting of Synod — the Report was ready the latter part of 1951. It is a bit unfortunate that our slow machinery keeps this Report from the churches for some five or six months, — though a brief digest of it was published in *The Banner* of February 1, 1952.

The Committee proposes that our Church be reorganized by the constitution of Particular Synods.

This proposal is of more than passing interest. This is one of those decisions that could considerably alter the life and history of our Church. Let no one suppose that this merely touches the externals of organization and administration. It has possibilities for reaching down deep into the life of our communion, and for shaping our historical development through the years to come.

The proposal for Particular Synods has bearing also on a study being made by another Synodical Committee concerning possible reorganization of the mission agencies of the Church.

It is good that the Committee on Par-

IN THIS ISSUE

Synod of 1952 in Prospect.....1	
by George Stob	
What Are the Last Things?.....3	
by James Daane	
Perspectives for Home Mission	
Advance5	
by Harold Dekker	
The Peril of Jargon.....7	
by Henry Zylstra	
What Linguistics Can Do for	
Missions9	
by Wm. E. Welmers	
Why Christian Schools?.....11	
by Wm. Harry Jellema	
Founding the Indigenous Church 13	
by Harry R. Boer	
Letters to the Journal15	

SYNOD OF 1952 IN PROSPECT — Continued

ticular Synods has given so comprehensive a report, and a so carefully outlined proposal for Church reorganization. This gives us a fine focus for study. It is more than likely — and no doubt desirable — that Synod will suspend definite action, and allow some time for due and thorough consideration of all that such reorganization may imply or ultimately involve.

Mission Principles

THE Committee appointed in 1950 “to formulate the principles of indigenous mission work based on . . . Scripture . . . and . . . our distinctively Reformed doctrines,” and “to formulate the regulations governing the application of such principles,” will likely present its report to the forthcoming Synod.

This, to my mind, is a large order. It calls virtually for a *theology of missions*, and for a plan of operation which is to be based upon theological principles, presumably after they have been formally and officially adopted by Synod.

I have some misgivings on this score.

For one thing, it is placing too great a burden upon even so competent a Committee as the Mission Principles Study Committee, to expect them to produce a more or less definitive theology of missions after only two years of intermittent study and discussion.

Secondly, it is exceedingly doubtful that Synod should think now of adopting a statement of theological principles on the subject of missions. This would be tantamount to an official formulation of Church dogma. But such Church dogma must grow out of the thinking of the Church and be the crystallization of convictions that have come out of long study of the Scriptures within the living context of the Church's missionary experience. Church dogma cannot be produced by an officially appointed Committee. It can only grow out of the thinking of the Church that studies the Scriptures while being led by the Holy Spirit into the truth. A Committee can only *formulate* the convictions which the Church has come to hold as a result of such a process.

The report of the present Study Committee will be tremendously valuable as being a significant part of that process. It will go into the thinking of the Church and help to shape the mind of the Church. But the Church will surely

not now commit the grave error of adopting principles which are to determine all future practice in every area. The Church will rather make her decisions in concrete cases, as the occasion demands, under the guidance of the best light she has from the Word of God at this moment. And some time later, perhaps, the Church will have come to such clear and consistent conviction on some of these matters that they can be formulated into basic principles for formal adoption. But that time is not yet.

The N. A. E.

IT appears from reports that proposals for a reconsideration of our withdrawal from the NAE will come to this Synod.

This is not surprising. The Editors of both of our Church papers brought the decision to withdraw from the NAE under sharpest criticism right after the Synod of 1951 had adjourned; and one of them called for overtures to be addressed to the Synod of 1952.

Furthermore, the Synod of 1951 unfortunately failed to adopt grounds and give reasons for its withdrawal. For the Church at large, therefore, the 1951 withdrawal seems an unreasoned action. It could hardly be expected that a segment of the Church not favorable to withdrawal could rest in a decision that is simply imposed without an expression of the convictions by which the decision was prompted. The official Church papers might have set forth Synod's mind for the benefit of our churches, but this was in fact not done.

It is not surprising, therefore, that overtures asking for reconsideration should come. And it is good for the Church that they have come. We can hardly expect our Church to rest in withdrawal from NAE when the convictions which prompted it are not officially recorded.

The Labor Problem

THERE is no Study Committee report on the problem.

But there are overtures from Classis Grand Rapids East that bear on the labor problem (Cf. *The Banner*, Feb. 15, 1952, 212, 213). These overtures concern the conditions under which building contracts are to be let by the Board of Trustees. There is strong sentiment against letting a contract to

The REFORMED JOURNAL

VOLUME II

APRIL, 1952

NO. 4

*A Periodical of Reformed Comment
and Opinion*

EDITORIAL BOARD

Rev. Harry R. Boer, Dr. James Daane,
Rev. George Stob, Dr. Henry Stob,
Dr. Henry Zylstra

Published each month by the
Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Subscription price: \$2.00 per year.
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post-
office at Grand Rapids, Mich.

Address all subscriptions and communica-
tions to:

THE REFORMED JOURNAL
255 Jefferson Avenue, S. E.
Grand Rapids 3, Mich.

a firm that operates with workers organized in a “so-called neutral labor organization.”

The present labor position of our Church is that “church-membership and membership in so-called neutral labor unions are compatible” (Cf. *Acts* 1946, pp. 103,104; *Acts* 1947, p. 89). The overtures now coming to Synod (and report has it that there are others), allow the possibility that the Church shall take official action prejudicial to those of our members who are members of a neutral union, even though the Church has already officially declared that such labor union membership is compatible with church membership.

This needs a little more study. We shall write about it more at length later.

* * *

There will be other matters coming before Synod, to be sure. We shall try to indicate those of largest importance and perhaps discuss some of them at fuller length in later issues of the *Journal*.

May God bless our Synodical delegates and our whole Church, as we together engage in the solemn duty of preparing for the work of the forthcoming Synod.

“Send out Thy light and Thy truth, let them lead us.” —GEORGE STOB

THE REFORMED JOURNAL

WHAT Are the Last Things? — II

By JAMES DAANE

THE preceding article in this series pointed out that in the traditional definition of the last things, the nature of the times has determined the nature of the event. Because the second coming of Christ and its attendant events happen during the last few days of time, these events — and these only — are regarded as the last things. Against this method of determining which are the last things, it was urged that the relation between Time and Event is just the reverse in biblical thought. In the Bible it is the nature of the Event that determines the nature of the Times. The Mid-point events of the Cross and Resurrection are regarded by the Bible as possessed of absolute finality and, therefore, as events which qualify all subsequent time as the last times. It is this understanding of time that accounts for the fact that the New Testament regards the whole New Testament dispensation as an eschatological period, and the end of the world as near. It is the failure of traditional eschatological thinking to define the last things as those things which happen in the last times as defined by the Bible, that accounts, on the one hand for its failure to gain the New Testament eschatological perspective, and on the other, for the inadequacies that appear when it uses its definition of eschatology as a working definition.

* * *

THE various doctrines included in Systematic Theologies under Eschatology fall into three categories. One category includes the second coming of Christ and its attendant events. Strictly speaking, only this material falls within the scope of eschatology as traditionally defined.

A second category includes the "final state." With this category the inadequacies of the traditional definition begin to appear. If the time-boundaries of the eschatological period are limited on its near and farther side by the second coming and its attendant events, then the final state does not fall within eschatology as traditionally defined, since the final state is neither an event, nor a state bounded by time on its farther side.

The inadequacies become very ap-

parent when we consider the third category, "Individual Eschatology," which includes: physical death, the immortality of the soul, and the intermediate state. On the traditional definition, physical death ought not to be included because it takes place all the time. Neither should the immortality of the soul be included because it is not an event; nor should the intermediate state be included because, as the term itself implies, it covers a span of time this side of the eschatological period as traditionally defined. Although many systematic theologians include these items under Eschatology, Professor Berkhof admits that, although he himself does so, they do not strictly speaking belong to Eschatology.

Traditional eschatological thinking faces two disconcerting facts. If it remains true to its definition it must exclude consideration of the final state and of the items of individual eschatology from its doctrine. Yet because of the eschatological significance of these items, they cannot be excluded. But if they are included because of their eschatological significance, then traditional eschatological thinking is compelled to include in its systematic theology what is by definition excluded, which does violence to the very idea of *systematic* theology. Aside from the more basic New Testament considerations, this alone signals the need for revision of the traditional definition.

* * *

WHY are the items of Individual Eschatology included under Eschatology even by systematic theologians who admit that these items do not really belong there? The answer is plain. *They are compelled to do so in order to get the individual into the eschatological situation.* When Eschatology is restricted to the time of the second coming, the task is then created of getting the persons who die prior to the second coming into the eschatological period. But this very idea is directly contrary to the teaching of the New Testament. In the New Testament physical death is never regarded as the agency by which a person first enters the eschatological situation. It is rather the New Testament teaching that physical death

is the last enemy that is overcome for the person already in the eschatological situation. It is not physical death, but spiritual death with Christ on his Cross, and regeneration, understood as a species of the Resurrection, which places a person in the eschatological situation.

Physical death does not in fact thrust an individual into the eschatological period of the second coming, but only into that intermediate state which obtains this side of the second coming. The point of special interest here is that traditional eschatological thinking is compelled, against its own definition, to give physical death this large eschatological role, only because it has excluded the individual during his life-time from the eschatological situation by its restricted definition of eschatology.

* * *

IT should also be observed that the traditional definition of Eschatology weakens Reformed Theology in its battle against the unorthodox view of eschatology current in the present theological world.

In the thought of Barth and Brunner, and in the thought of Tillich, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Pauck, eschatological realities are non-historical. Such eschatological realities as the Kingdom of God, sanctification, eternal life, are never real — not even in principle — within history. They are rather ideal, existing outside history in the realm of the trans-historical. Since they are regarded as never real within history, but always ideal and outside of history, they serve the function of judging everything within history. In his *The Heritage of the Reformation*, Pauck, for example, claims that this principle is the distinctive feature of the Protestant Faith.

No Reformed man will consciously subscribe to this view of Eschatology. Yet on the traditional definition, Reformed Eschatology has little *theological* protection against this distortion of eschatology which denies any eschatological significance to the historicity of the Cross and Resurrection because eschatology is wholly ideal and trans-historical, and the traditional definition which, although it insists on the historicity of the Cross and Resurrection,

WHAT ARE THE LAST THINGS? — Continued

nonetheless fails to ground its eschatology in this historical basis because it too regards eschatology as, strictly speaking, something ideal and as futuristic as the second coming itself. The only difference on this score will be the Reformed insistence upon the historicity of the second coming and the end of the world. But mere insistence does not win theological battles.

Dialectical theology is weak and wobbly on future eschatology. The question of a real second coming and a real end of the world receives no certain answer. Its uncertainty regarding future eschatology is a consequence of its failure to realize the core of eschatology actualized in the historical Cross and Resurrection. By the same token Reformed eschatology as constructed on the lines of the traditional definition has weakened itself for the battle that must be fought against the dialectical conception of eschatology. When, by definition, it reduces what it regards as eschatology strictly speaking, to that which is yet outside history, it overlooks the eschatological material realized in the first coming of Christ out of which it could forge its most effective eschatological weapons, and is left standing unarmed on the theological battlefield with no more than its will to resist.

The danger indicated above is not imaginary. Reformed men sometimes unconsciously express themselves on eschatology in a manner that shows essential agreement with dialectical eschatology. Whenever the eschatological is equated with that which is wholly ideal and outside history, so that the ideal Church or State is defined as eschatological because it is allegedly wholly outside history, one has also taken the step which brings one outside biblical thought.

We should learn from the fate that eschatology has suffered at the hand of the dialectical theologians. Unless eschatology is grounded in the eschatological realities already actualized in history, future eschatology is rendered uncertain, and the door is opened to regard anything that is ideal as eschatological as is done when men speak of an eschatological state. According to the New Testament, eschatology has its ideal future aspects, but these are regarded with assured hope because faith has discerned and taken its stand upon

the eschatological realities already actualized in history.

* * *

IN current eschatological studies the claim is being pressed that eschatology is an *outlook*, not a separate body of doctrine. All Christian doctrines are said to be eschatological, thereby creating an "outlook" that is the special concern of eschatology.

This view of eschatology contains enough truth to warrant consideration. Its insistence that all Christian doctrines are eschatological, and thereby provide Christian faith with a distinctive outlook upon all time and history is wholesome and needed.

Traditional Reformed eschatological thinking has never adequately generated a sharp awareness of these two factors. A. Kuyper, G. Vos, and others, have indeed asserted that all, or almost all, doctrines possess an eschatological quality. Yet it can hardly be said that this has been explored in theology and stressed in preaching to the point where it has become a characteristic mood of Reformed theology and Reformed piety. There seems to be little sensitivity to the eschatological features of the sacraments, faith, justification, sabbath, common grace, law and grace, and little awareness of the significance of eschatology for Christian Ethics. Nor need it be urged that neither of these two factors has received fruitful expression in our systematic theologies. It would seem even less necessary to urge that they never will receive such expression as long as the traditional restricted definition of eschatology dominates our eschatological thinking. Unless there is a return to the core of realized eschatology of the first coming of Christ to bring its treasures into our formulations of eschatology, the eschatological features of all Christian doctrines, and the eschatological mood generated by them, will continue to be hidden from us.

* * *

EVERY department of Systematic Theology has its object of special concern. Christology, for example, deals with the person and work of Christ; Soteriology with the subjective application of salvation. But what is the special object of Eschatology? What are the last things?

This is a difficult question, as is ap-

parent from the variety of answers given by systematic theologians. Some have no separate section dealing with eschatology. They treat eschatology in connection with Christology or Soteriology. Most theologians have such a separate section, but vary greatly as to what they include in it. Some include the doctrine of the immortality of the soul; others feel this has no place in eschatology. Some give special treatment to physical death; others do not. Some maintain that eschatology arises in pagan religions and in secular philosophy, as well as in Christianity. Others would deny this. Some include a section on Individual Eschatology. Most theologians agree that eschatology should be handled in systematic theology with the method that is peculiar to systematics. Yet not a few theologians who reject the method of Coccejus because his method was a historical, not a systematic, method, nonetheless, because of their subscription to the traditional limitation of eschatology, find themselves employing the historical method in actual practise. About the only formal characteristic that is common to them all is the acceptance of a conception of eschatology which limits it to the second coming of Christ. In view of this general confusion and lack of agreement, it seems strange that systematic theologians seem never to have considered the possibility that their failure to achieve general clarity and agreement is due to the one formal thing they have in common: their restricted definition of eschatology.

Complex and difficult though the question is, it would seem safe to assert that the first step toward the right answer is the re-capture of the New Testament definition of eschatology. I venture the thesis that when this New Testament definition is re-captured, it will be discovered that in the New Testament eschatology is concerned with the last things: 1. as they have been essentially realized in the first coming of Christ, negatively as expressed in the Cross (the End) and positively as expressed in the Resurrection (the Endless); 2. as they are progressively realized during the whole New Testament dispensation, in their negative aspect as that divine judgment by which sinful history is brought to nought, and in their positive aspect in the realization of God's eternal Kingdom; and 3. as they are completed (not begun) at the second coming of Christ, at which point that which was begun in the Cross

and Resurrection is completed and rendered unalterable, and thereby obtains that double state of things which correspond to the Cross and Resurrection, respectively, namely, Hell and Heaven.

Such a view of eschatology grounds the final state of things in the *finality* of the Cross and Resurrection. It grounds all eschatology in that only legitimate point of eschatological departure — from which eschatological thinking may never depart — namely, the historicity of the Cross and Resurrection, and thereby allows these events to eschatologically determine all future times. It protects the absolutely decisive character of the time-division effected by the first coming against the encroachments of a “second-coming eschatology” which inevitably tends to regard the time-line of the second coming as more decisive than that of the first coming, and thus tends to shift the center of the gospel from the Cross to the second coming. Such a view of eschatology also makes it possible to think concretely about the “old” and the “new.” When “new” is defined by a “second-coming eschatology,” “new” tends to be defined apart from the “new” of the first coming as defined by the *New Testament*, and as a result

Heaven is conceived abstractly. Likewise, when the “old” is defined by a “second coming eschatology,” the “old” is disassociated from the Cross, with the result that the idea of the End and the idea of Hell are abstractly conceived. It is only when the idea of the End is defined in terms of the Cross, and the idea of the Endless in terms of the Resurrection, that the biblical idea of the last things and the last times can include everything forward, from the Cross and Resurrection, including the final state, and thus save eschatology from being empty and abstract.

Such a view of Eschatology will also gain for itself a new relevance and significance for the present. For it is only in an eschatology that is grounded in and defined by the Cross and Resurrection, that the biblical idea of the Signs of the End and second coming of Christ can be rescued from distortions and abstractions, and their full eschatological significance regained for the whole *New Testament* eschatological period.

Thus the idea of “last” in last things would retain its double meaning which, even in English, it possesses. The word “last” means a point beyond which there is nothing, namely the End. But

“last” also means that which endures, namely, the Endless. In the biblical idea of “last” it possesses the former meaning by virtue of the Cross: the end of the reign of sin and death; its latter meaning it possesses by virtue of the Resurrection: the endless that endures precisely because it cannot again be invaded by sin. Unless “last” in eschatology is defined by this reference to the Cross and Resurrection, the biblical idea of “last” will remain ambiguous and obscure.

* * *

What are the last things? They are all the things that fall into *the last times as defined by the Bible*. Since the last times are “last” because of the nature of the Events of the Cross and Resurrection, the last things are all the things that follow the Cross and Resurrection and possess the quality of “last” as determined by these events. Only thus do all things stand under the Sign of the End and under the Sign of the Endless.

The proper object and concern of Eschatology in Systematic Theology would be a concern to unfold this aspect of Christian truth.

Perspectives for Home Mission Advance

By HAROLD DEKKER

IT is not unlikely that future historians of the Christian Reformed Church will find the most significant development during the years following World War II to have been the expansion of missions. And when that story is finally told, it may very well be said that this was a new day especially for home missions. For whereas the Church had always had a rather broad vision for foreign missions, its ken for home missions had been rather limited.

Without even venturing any such predictions, it can be safely said right now that never before in the history of the Christian Reformed Church has there been as much discussion in public print and ecclesiastical assemblies regarding missions, as much grass-roots interest in neighborhood evangelism, as many students at the Seminary interested in a ministry with an outreach, and as large an opportunity for a strategic witness and an extension of the Church into this nation.

A Unique Responsibility

IT must also be said that never before have our responsibilities weighed so heavily upon us. For today in God's mysterious providence the Christian Reformed Church, small and inadequate though it be, carries the enormous burden of being one of the few denominations which is still consistently Reformed in its witness. There are a good many larger denominations which were historically Reformed and which still contain sizeable cells of Calvinistic orthodoxy, but which as denominations have more or less compromised their witness with Modernism and Arminianism. Let us seek to thoroughly purge ourselves from all pride and self-esteem in these things, for surely we “have this treasure in earthen vessels,” but let us nonetheless humbly recognize the facts for what they are. And the facts force us to realize that in America today the cause

of a genuinely Calvinistic theological witness, and the cause of a truly Reformed ecclesiastical advance rest in no small degree with the Christian Reformed Church and its various home mission agencies.

It goes almost without saying that we also recognize the comradeship of a common cause with all those in other communions who share like precious faith with us, and our home mission tactics must increasingly allow for correlation and coordination with what they are doing and plan to do. With all those who seek the strategic advance of the Reformed faith we must take counsel, and we must always stand ready to both serve and be served, so that with all prudence and economy of effort our great mission to America may most speedily and effectively be accomplished.

This is an aspect of our ecumenical problem, it may be pointed out incidentally. We are far from a complete

PERSPECTIVES FOR HOME MISSION ADVANCE

acquaintance with our Reformed allies in America. Ecumenical relations with "Evangelicals" have helped us surprisingly little in this. The finding of these friends involves no small difficulty. Some of them bear strange ecclesiastical labels. Most of them are in small and isolated minorities, virtually lost to their brothers and sisters. Calvinism in America is not dead by any means. But where it has root it is more of a confused growth than a cultivated garden in neat rows. One of the values of our radio ministry is that it serves to find these scattered patches as no other agency can do. One of the tasks of home mission husbandry is to follow up in tilling them wherever they are found, and insofar as possible to transplant them to some orderly Reformed acre.

Neighborhood Evangelism

THE scrutiny which we are now giving to neighborhood evangelism, as it is practiced among us, is both timely and necessary. There are two main patterns of home mission advance, and the one for neighborhood evangelism needs to be clearly outlined. Undoubtedly this task belongs basically to the local church in its unity. There is a sense in which every congregation is a mission, and a sense in which every officer and every member of the church is a missionary. When the community chapel appears in the neighborhood of the congregation, it is there by default of the congregation. Neither can the congregation abdicate to the classis, although certainly there are supervisory and advisory functions which are proper to that body, functioning through its home missions committee. Professional workers, both lay and ordained, most certainly have their special place in neighborhood evangelism, but never to the exclusion of the rank and file of the congregation, and then only working directly from and toward the congregation itself. And the organization of new churches in our denominational centers must be fitted into this pattern of neighborhood evangelism by their careful placement in terms of community need and evangelistic opportunity.

Big Cities Beckon

IT remains to deal at somewhat greater length with some of the perspectives for home mission advance in

areas not reached by the local church, by evangelism at large and by the establishment of new frontier churches.

One of the most important of these perspectives is the strategic importance of concentrating for some years on the big cities of our nation. Reformed Christianity is quite disintegrated in America today. Only seldom is it embodied in a homogeneous ecclesiastical witness, and only rarely in a congregation with the striking power of the means of grace properly exercised. Back to God Hour mail response, and personal investigation pursuant to it, both indicate that there are hundreds of cities in our nation without a single church which in its life and teaching approximates the message which we proclaim on the air.

To cite examples is not difficult. Selected almost at random from our radio mail are these two typical instances. Both are from cities far-removed from our denominational centers. Both are as recent as February. The one writes: "You will never know the peace, comfort, knowledge, and assurance which your sermons bring. Thank you utterly. Surely God is using you in a mighty ministry to establish His truth... I teach a class from many denominations. May I have 30 copies of your sermon given in February to relay to them? We had much on election while in Hebrews.... What church would you join here? I have visited (names given). These are very Modernistic. I long for a church home true to the Word. The preachers of — Church stay with the Word as they understand it, but they do not believe many precious truths that I find in the Word. Should I join a church whose tenets I do not completely accept?"

The other writes as follows: "The truth is so reasonable and clearly laid out. It surely is reaching many who do not ordinarily listen to sermons. I belong to one of those modern churches and I feel that it is my place to stay and work quietly for the Truth. But how I wish such a church as yours were here. It would be home. Thank you for all the program has meant to me and others I know."

The Christian Reformed Church is found in comparatively few of our larger cities. In most of the others there is no genuinely Reformed body with which we can cooperate. Certainly the same may be said of the majority of our smaller cities and towns. The

opportunities for denominational outreach are therefore vast, so vast as to be almost staggering. We must form some policy by which we may be guided in the selection of our immediate objectives. It is suggested that this policy be *to give priority to the larger cities which do not now have a church adequately representing Reformed Christianity.*

Other opportunities abound, but they may have to be passed by for some years in the interests of the best strategy. The establishment of mission churches within and around our denominational centers may have to be curtailed somewhat in order to use with the greatest efficiency the supply of men and money available for home missions. Long-range planning would seem to favor our concern primarily for the next few years with outlying centers of population, so that as quickly as possible our forces will be adequately deployed for effective action on a broad scale. Increasingly our churches should be so situated that they will be of maximum effectiveness in carrying the Reformed faith to America, so located that they become available to a maximum number of people, and so blueprinted that they can eventually throw up an evangelistic front of maximum dimensions.

A Ten-Year Plan

SUCH a policy would, of course, require detail in order to make it workable and effective, detail which could be worked out by our denominational home mission leadership. Toward a specific plan we might think in terms of a ten year period for occupying big cities. For ten years we would be intent on gaining beachheads, which could then be gradually expanded as centers for later advance into the surrounding areas which these large cities dominate.

During the first year that our radio follow-up program has been under way, regular Christian Reformed services have already been started in five cities where they were not previously held. These are Albuquerque, Champaign-Urbana, New York City (Harlem), Philadelphia, and Salt Lake City — the smallest of them well over 100,000 in population. With the exception of the Negro work in Harlem, they all include in their nucleus both former Christian Reformed members and interested radio listeners. In Harlem it is beginning with the latter. Suppose

that five such projects were to be undertaken in each of the next ten years. That would mean the establishment of fifty-five new frontier churches, situated in all or nearly all states of the Union, by the time that we would, God willing, be generally mobilized for a great mission to America. In those same ten years we could come to know our Reformed allies across the nation, and develop a plan for concerted action.

Flexible Methods

THE immediate objection to such a plan is the cost. Admittedly, according to conventional methods the cost would be prohibitive. We have our commitments in Canada. It may be that Canada now receives a disproportionate share of our home mission budget, but even when this is brought into better proportion, we can still scarcely afford to spend \$50,000 or \$60,000 for a modest church and parsonage in each of five new places per year, in addition

to the salaries and other expenses involved.

What is the answer? Perhaps we should undertake such pioneer work according to more flexible methods. Admittedly there are places where it will be found wise to immediately invest funds in buildings. But why not send out some missionaries who will use typical Pauline tactics? Let them go to this big city or that — calling on radio listeners, canvassing various neighborhoods, holding classes in doctrine for small groups in homes, conducting Sunday services in rented or borrowed quarters — probing and testing, building and shepherding, so that in due time the Church will be gathered according to the due processes of grace, or else the missionary will go on to the next city. As one of the members of the General Committee of Home Missions recently pointed out, that kind of work can be done for about \$5,000 per year per missionary. Moreover if a church results, let it find its own way financially to a larger extent than we usually

expect, without, of course, excluding all denominational assistance. And even if no church results, has not the King's money been wisely spent in the salary and expense of a missionary who has witnessed on the streets and in the homes of a modern Athens?

Does someone protest that we do not have ministers who will carry on such work? The answer is two-fold. First, we have not yet issued any calls of this kind. Second, it is known that there are members of the graduating class at Calvin Seminary, soon to be ministerial candidates, who have such a vision and such a zeal for home missions that it is not unlikely that some of them would respond to this challenge. Indications are that God is raising up a generation of younger ministers, some of whom are ready to serve as pioneer home missionaries, using pioneer methods. God is giving us men who may be willing to go to Memphis or Norfolk, to Madison or Columbus, to Boston or Buffalo, to New Orleans or Spokane. Shall we not call them? Perhaps two or three this year?

THE PERIL OF JARGON

By HENRY ZYLSTRA

JARGON is a word which, unfortunately, has come to stand for almost every kind of bad diction. But when, as at this moment, I am concerned to warn against it in our Reformed preaching and apology, I am using the word *jargon* in a restricted sense. I am using it in the sense which the dictionary circumscribes very nicely as "the technical vocabulary of a science, art, trade, sect, profession, or other special group." The word nearest it in meaning, but not quite the equal of it, is *lingo*, a "foreign language or style of speech strange to people."

Such jargon is not necessarily a bad thing. It is, in fact, a necessary product of specialization. We all know how it comes into being. When specialists fence off a particular area of reality in order to study it intensively, they make fine distinctions within the limits of that area. Such distinctions require accurate delimitation, far more accurate delimitation, indeed, than the non-specialist is used to making. They accordingly develop a terminology adequate for designating these distinctions.

Such terminology, the specialized diction of scientists, is jargon.

In time this jargon becomes a thing almost secret, almost occult, to the uninitiated. Witness the language of the law, for instance. You think you have sold a piece of property, but you hardly recognize your own transaction in the way the lawyer writes it up. Witness the technical vocabulary of medicine. Look at your doctor's report, if you can get hold of it, when he transfers your case to another doctor. He may tell you that you are suffering a relapse from the flu, but see what he tells his colleague. Or look at the *Journal of the American Medical Association*. You will then see what is meant by *lingo* defined as a foreign language strange to people.

Professional philosophers, too, although they should resent my implication that they "fence off a particular area of reality" for investigation, tend to use a diction peculiar to their profession. I once spent a day at a conference of such philosophers, and I left mainly wondering whether I was still in English-speaking territory. If you want to observe what such jargon looks

like, read a piece or two in *The Thomist*, *The Monist*, *The Personalist*, or *Philosophia Reformata*. Here is a typical piece of specialized philosophical diction, lifted from a discussion of the English philosopher F. H. Bradley:

This is an elliptical way of indicating something of what it means to say that, for Bradley, relations are internal to the qualities they relate. Relations contribute to constitute the qualities they differentiate, and qualities contribute to the constitution of the differentiations they terminate. Now since qualities and relations are the two inseparable aspects of incessant process, it follows that a quality transcends itself through the relations which differentiate it. . . . There is nothing exotic, occult, or academic in the fact of self-transcendence.

Now there may be nothing occult about the fact of self-transcendence, but there is something occult, and something academic, too, about the jargon in which that piece of philosophy is embodied.

Theology, too, is a specialized science, no less so because we all, as

THE PERIL OF JARGON — Continued

good Protestants, know a little more about it than we do about law, medicine, chemistry, or philosophy. Each of the schools of theology develops its special set of distinctions, and each of the individual exponents of a school is likely to be pinning down his discriminations by a diction partly peculiar to himself. So it comes about that there are clusters of words characteristic of Barthianism, clusters of words characteristic of Catholic existentialism, and clusters of words characteristic of Reformed orthodoxy.

Yes, there is also a Reformed jargon, as legitimate in its birth, and as indispensable for clarity of reference and precision of meaning, as any other jargon. It is scientific Reformed theological language, and these are some of the terms of it: *amillennial, covenant-consciousness, communion of saints, office of believers, special revelation, general revelation, special grace, common grace, total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, perseverance of the saints, the sovereignty of God, the cultural mandate*, and myriad others. This is specialist jargon as distinguished from the common, humanized language of men. Our children, before indoctrination has done its necessary work, come to these terms as to a foreign tongue, and they hear none of them anywhere except at church.

It would be a great gain all around if this jargon, which consists really of other men's summarized concepts of things, would call up to our minds all that the men who first shaped it intended to say. But just here lies a limitation and peril of jargon. When decades or centuries of arduous theological scholarship have finally made for the clear understanding of a matter, and have defined it with a word or phrase appropriate to that understanding, it happens as often as not that those who come after accept the word for the meaning, and the meaning for the thing.

Take such a concept and such a phrase as *common grace*, for example. The phrase is itself a piece of family language, of specialized theological science, and it is a coin so current among us that we can hardly talk of religion and life for an hour without use of it. But how many of us, if we did not have the phrase to refer to, could communicate an intelligible sense of the philosophical and theological problem to which the doctrine of com-

mon grace is a formulated solution? We bandy the phrase around so facilely, but it would be a good exercise for us all to try to communicate the idea it stands for without reference to the term.

And what I say of *common grace* is, I think, true for most of those terms listed in italics overhead. They are so often used — it is a kind of specialist's temptation so to use them — as a substitute for explanation, or as the evidence of the thing for which they are not the proof but the name. Sometimes, even, they constitute the jumping off place rather than the destination of exegesis. And it would seem to be more realistically orthodox to use them once at the end of sermon, lecture, or article rather than twenty times at the beginning. These terms come to us surrounded by the halo of classic formulation, and the aureole surrounding the classic can be a great barrier to appreciation.

Somehow we must try to come to these formulations, as for the first time, so to speak, shouting Eureka at the freshness of surprising discovery. So far, then, from beginning with someone else's finished definition, we shall have to try to recapture his sense of it. This requires something besides catechetical indoctrination. We shall have to stand by in the smithy of theological history again, watch the concept being beaten into shape, and see it plunged

into the forge, whether of Council or Synod; indeed, we shall have to seize the hammer ourselves, and bend the recalcitrant stuff into this same shape, pleased that it is the same which the fathers fashioned.

And when we present our apology to the outside world, we must be doubly on guard, lest we think that our language, with which we have grown up and which has been the medium of communication among each other for decades, means anything to others. This is, indeed, one of the educational uses of addressing ourselves to the outside world. We find that we cannot make our stock terms the basis of inference and conclusion, that we must put up an explanation instead of a word. It is a searching business, really, and is sure to show up the gaps in our self-integrity.

I venture to suggest one peril further. It is that jargon, which is the language of scientific theology, is not the appropriate medium for communication in the non-scientific contexts of sermon, lecture, and article. We must somehow get the benefit of our scientific specialization translated again into the common, humanized language of men. If we cannot do this we are partial men and have been victimized by our specialties. I take it at least that a sermon is rather more a work of art than a body of science. And art is always and necessarily the foe of specialization.

Whenever, therefore, we meet with heathen writers, let us learn from that light of truth which is admirably displayed in their works, that the human mind, fallen as it is, and corrupted from its integrity, is yet invested and adorned by God with excellent talents. If we believe that the Spirit of God is the only fountain of truth, we shall neither reject nor despise the truth itself, wherever it shall appear, unless we wish to insult the Spirit of God; for the gifts of the Spirit cannot be undervalued without offering contempt and reproach to the Spirit himself. Now, shall we deny the light of truth to the ancient lawyers, who have delivered such just principles of civil order and polity? Shall we say that the philosophers were blind in their exquisite contemplation and in their scientific description of nature? Shall we say that those, who by the art of logic have taught us to speak in a manner consistent with reason, were destitute of understanding themselves? Shall we accuse those of insanity, who by the study of medicine have been exercising their industry for our advantage? What shall we say of all the mathematics? Shall we esteem them the delirious ravings of madmen? On the contrary, we shall not be able even to read the writings of the ancients on these subjects without great admiration; we shall admire them, because we shall be constrained to acknowledge them to be truly excellent . . . Therefore, since it appears that those whom the Scripture styles 'natural men', have discovered such acuteness and perspicacity in the investigation of sublunary things, let us learn from such examples, how many good qualities the Lord has left to the nature of man, since it has been despoiled of what is truly good.

— JOHN CALVIN, Institutes, Bk. II, Chap. ii, Par. 15

What Linguistics Can Do for Missions — I

By WM. E. WELMERS*

How do you suppose it would feel to be a missionary arriving at your new home abroad for the first time? The climate, the foliage, the crops, the buildings, and even the sounds and smells, are all new and strange. You will have some chance to get used to it all in the company of experienced missionaries, but before very long you will have to take care of yourself in this mysterious land. Certainly one of the most striking impressions of your first days is the seemingly chaotic babble of an exotic language. You know that your task is to preach, to teach, and to minister to the needs of the people around you. You assume that you are going to learn their language, but you begin to wonder how long it will take you. As a matter of fact, you probably have hardly any idea of what is involved in the process of learning a new language.

It will do you very little good to start by trying to learn the Ten Commandments or the Lord's Prayer in the local language — even if a reliable translation of them exists. Your first need of the language arises when a man stops to say hello, when someone brings bananas for you to buy, or when a woman asks for an empty tin can. If you cannot talk about earthly things, you surely cannot expect to explain heavenly things.

It is something of a relief when you find a few people who speak a bit of English or French, but they are an insignificant minority. Nor can you expect to use them as interpreters in talking to others. Some missions have tried to work entirely through interpreters, and they have failed. If you want Shakespeare's plays translated into German, you would never think of entrusting the job to a German maid who learned English while working for a

lieutenant in the occupation forces. Yet she has approximately the qualifications of the average interpreter on the mission field. There is no way around it. You are simply going to have to master the language yourself.

The Missionary and the Language

BUT why worry about it? If you live among the people, aren't you bound to pick up their language? Haven't earlier missionaries learned to speak it fluently? Haven't they even translated parts of the Bible into it, and maybe written an outline of the grammar to help the newcomer? Why, perhaps there is even a language school for you to attend. Learning the language may not be easy, but time and devotion seem to be about all that is needed.

Unfortunately, it is not so simple as all that. Most of us know people who have come to this country from Europe as adults, and whose English is quite limited and imperfect after twenty years or more — although English may be closely related to their native language. The same thing happens on the mission field. There are missionaries with more than twenty years of service who can do no more than carry on the most elementary conversations with the people they meet daily. One such missionary sent for some rice meal to feed a dying woman, and was brought salt. She had never mastered the distinction in pronunciation between the two words. Another missionary attended a language school, and seemed to be getting along well with the language around the mission compound — where nearly everyone was used to hearing missionaries talk, and made allowances for his poor use of the language. But when he preached in a village that foreigners had seldom visited, his listeners never realized that the sermon was supposed to be in their own language, and expressed their regret at not being able to understand English!

Even the preparation of translations does not always mean that the missionary really knows the language. Missionaries in Liberia thought they were teaching the people to pray 'Lead us

not into temptation,' but until 1946 they were praying 'Do not catch us when we do wrong' — and the missionaries wondered why the people were less concerned about stealing than about being caught stealing. Of all the Ten Commandments, only four or five were reasonably understandable. Twenty-five years earlier, the Gospel of Mark was published in that language, and to this day no one — missionary or native — can read it. The written form of the language used in it represents the spoken sounds so inadequately that no one can puzzle out the meaning without the help of an English version. The Bible Societies can multiply examples of published translations that only gather dust on the shelves — simply because the missionary who prepared the translation had never really mastered the language. And mark this well — such missionaries are often intelligent, devoted men, conscientiously doing their very best. They are neither stupid nor indifferent.

Of course, I am not describing every missionary. Some of them have phenomenal success in learning the language of the people. They speak it as if it were their native language. They can use the proverbs and the humor that touch the people so intimately. They find simple, unmistakable terms in which to express the profoundest truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. They write and translate clearly and convincingly. It takes a lot of intangible qualities to produce such a missionary. Call them, if you want to, a 'knack' for language learning.

And between these extremes are a lot of other missionaries — most of them, in fact. They manage to get along fairly well in the language. They make themselves understood for the most part, and their work more than repays our support. But isn't it just possible that the general quality of their language learning could be improved? At the very least, we cannot afford to be complacent about the situation. We cannot take it for granted that the somewhat haphazard facilities for you to learn a language on the mission field are the best that can possibly be provided. There is reason for concern.

*Dr. Welmerts is a graduate of Hope College and Westminster Theological Seminary and is a minister in the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. In post-graduate study he specialized in Linguistics. He subsequently worked on African languages, both for the government and under sponsorship of the American Council of Learned Societies. While engaged in these undertakings Dr. Welmerts was of great linguistic assistance to several missions, including that of the Christian Reformed Church in Nigeria. He is at present associated with the department of Linguistics at Cornell University. The sequel to his article will follow next month.

WHAT LINGUISTICS CAN DO FOR MISSIONS

The Need for Guidance

THE difficulty lies in the fact that missionaries and mission boards have been operating on the *false assumption that language learning on the mission field requires no specialized training or professional guidance*. In our schools in this country, we go to supposedly expert specialists to learn French, German, Latin, Greek, or Hebrew. But we expect our missionaries to learn some language of Africa or Asia far more thoroughly, and we see them off at the boat without giving them the vaguest hint on how to go about it. Hours of guided drill go into teaching a basketball player to control his feet. Yet many missionaries are completely unaware that there is such a thing as controlling the organs of speech, and very few of them have ever had any help in learning to do it. The missionary is turned loose in a maze of new sounds, new grammatical categories, and new constructions without any notion of how to discover them or master them.

Even when some help is available on the field, it is rarely reliable professional help. The help may consist of a word list and a few common phrases and sentences. Or there may be some paradigms of verb forms and a few more or less organized comments on the grammar. There may even be a set of fairly elaborate lessons used in an organized language school. Whatever it is, it is almost invariably the work of an equally untrained pioneer missionary. The poor quality of language mastery on the mission field is proof of the inadequacy of such amateur help.

It is perfectly true that technical linguistic training for prospective missionaries has not been available until very recent years. It is also true, however, that most missionaries and mission boards have failed to recognize their need until it was pointed out to them, and that many of them have not yet begun to take advantage of the scientific training that is now available. Missionaries can be prepared for their work in a new language. Their preparation can be provided by the science known as *linguistics*.

What Is a Linguist?

PERHAPS a word of background is in order here. Some readers of this article may have heard about that gang

of pagan mechanists who call themselves 'descriptive linguists'. These rascals are not satisfied that the physical universe has been locked up in a laboratory. They insist on taking the most intimate reflection of man's soul, the distinctive evidence of God's image in man, the very vehicle of thought and emotion, the medium of art and the tool of eloquence — human language itself — and treating it like a chemical compound to be broken up into its components, analyzed, measured, and described in cold mathematical formulae. They respect neither the moving cadence of a great sonnet nor the cherished conventions of grammatical usage, but drag the glories of rhetoric through the dust of phonetic diagrams, morpheme alternants, and immediate constituents. Well, it is quite true that a good many descriptive linguists are admittedly mechanists and behaviorists. The same can be said for a good many professors in medical schools, and yet we are willing to sit at their feet and learn. Even the Calvinistic doctor, who knows just a little about man's true nature, is forced to treat life in terms of heartbeat, oxygen supply, and a fight against infection. In the nature of the case he cannot study, handle, or treat the human soul. The situation in linguistics is somewhat comparable. The very use of words like *reflection, vehicle, medium, tool* to refer to language is an admission that we are dealing with something external and observable, not directly with the mind or the soul itself. The Calvinistic linguist is quite aware that man thinks, and that both his thought and his language exist by virtue of his having been created in the image of God. But he also knows he is no mind-reader, and that he can study only *what people say*. Neither he nor even his behaviorist colleague despises literature, but he does consider it simply a highly specialized and limited use of language, not language itself in some sublime distillation. Nor is the average linguist the grammatical anarchist he is sometimes accused of being. He is quite willing to accept a new word or a new usage when it has become so commonplace that no one (except an occasional English teacher) notices it, but he doesn't encourage his children or his pupils to say 'It don't make no difference'. In short, the linguist is a respectable scientist, and should be treated in the same way we treat other scientists —

with humble respect and with evangelistic zeal. We should certainly not hesitate to use linguistics, as we use medicine and other sciences, for the furtherance of our missionary endeavor.

The Adequacy of a Language

THE first thing linguistics can do is to disabuse us, and our missionaries in particular, of some naive and erroneous notions about languages. In doing so, it will also teach us what to expect by way of *speech sounds and structural patterns* in a new language, and will give us techniques for finding out how people speak and for learning how to speak like they do.

When we think of 'primitive' peoples (meaning, I suppose, that they don't use tractors or washing machines), we are likely to imagine that they speak 'primitive' languages. I have often been asked to confirm a common impression that African tribes get along with a few hundred or perhaps a thousand words, and that the variety of expressions possible in their languages is very much limited. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Of course, you can hardly expect an African language to have specific terms for a condenser, a blizzard, or psychoanalyzing, but it may well have different words for a dozen species of ants, and a rich technical vocabulary of terms associated with activities such as spinning and weaving, the English equivalents of which are quite unfamiliar to most of us today. Every language is perfectly capable of expressing anything that its speakers have occasion to say — and like most of us, the African finds a lot to talk about and loves to talk. Moreover, as fast as people adopt new things, new ideas, and new occupations, they construct or borrow words to talk about them. In English we have coined *jeep*, assigned a technical meaning to *bazooka*, constructed *television* from elements of other words, and borrowed *massage, alcohol, guava, thug, coffee, and succotash* from six different languages scattered around the world. The missionary is limited only by the people's ignorance of our culture, and by his own ignorance of theirs.

Another alleged evidence of the 'primitive' nature of many languages is the fact that they have no writings and no literature. Why, the people are so ignorant that they can't even read and write! Surely their language must be 'undeveloped' and completely un-

stable. Perhaps it doesn't even deserve to be called a 'language'; it may be merely a 'dialect.' Well, Greek had not been written for many centuries before Homer, but no Greek scholar would welcome a suggestion that Homer's language was 'undeveloped' or undeserving the name 'language.' Writing and literature do very little to 'develop' or 'stabilize' a language. They simply record it for future reference. English has been a written language for

over a thousand years, but it has changed so radically that we study Beowulf and Chaucer as foreign languages, we publish a glossary with an edition of Shakespeare, and (though we don't like to admit it) we find it a little difficult to follow the meaning of the King James Version of the Bible, though we may read it daily. War, science, business, exploration, travel, and migrations have unquestionably in-

fluenced our language far more profoundly than our writing and our literary traditions have. The languages of Africa and Asia change in the same way — and apparently at just about the same rate. To think of them as primitive, undeveloped, or inferior smacks strongly of social snobbery and race prejudice. Such attitudes come with singularly ill grace from the Christian missionary.

WHY CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS?

By W. HARRY JELLEMA

ON reading the N.A.E. Committee Report, *Christian Education in a Democracy*, one who is familiar with our Christian schools and with our thinking as to their necessity will find himself profoundly heartened and grateful.

Here is unhesitating witness to truths that we, too, believe fundamental and determinative. The Bible is unqualifiedly affirmed to be infallible revelation; man is recognized as God's creature in His image, but fallen from his high estate; apart from personal and faithful surrender to Christ Jesus as divine Savior, there is no salvation; in Him alone is eternal life. The foundation of Christian education is "the Bible with its life-giving revelation of Jesus Christ."

And the reader who is committed to our system of Christian education will on almost every page find corollaries of such basic truths; corollaries which have long since won his cordial assent. "Much that passes for Christian education in American schools and colleges is nothing more than well-intentioned morality and kindly altruism." Christian education "must integrate the Book of books with every area of human knowledge." In a Christian school every member of the faculty, whether he teaches Bible or algebra, "must be thoroughly committed to its distinctive philosophy." Or again, "America needs revival; but, because its problems are many and deep, it needs revival which combines spiritual fervor with an intellectual force able to wrestle victoriously with unbelief." "Of recent years evangelicalism has not been producing its share of scholarly work, and its hope of intellectual

rehabilitation lies in training teachers and scholars who know the meaning of higher learning and who can express their findings with compelling force." "What must be pressed upon the multitudes of Protestants who are committed to an inspired Bible and the Gospel is a realization that there is no more direct form of stewardship than to support Christian education."

The list of such significant quotations and theses, in substance familiar to all of us in our own apologetic for Christian education, could be greatly extended. At no point in the book is one beyond at least the echo of some statement with such accustomed ring.

* * *

BUT the reader who is familiar with our Christian schools and with our thinking on their necessity will also observe in the argumentation of the N.A.E. Committee Report a line of approach which is subtly and yet essentially different. And this difference is not unrelated to a difference in conception of the nature of Christian education.

To state the difference very generally and very starkly: We have Christian schools because church and home were doing their duty; a major thrust of the Committee's argument is that Christian schools are necessary because church and home have not been doing their duty. And to the extent that this latter thrust is present, the Committee's argument is toward a school which will do what the church and home ought to have done, but failed to do. It is the determining influence of this latter thrust which leads to the formulation of the aim of Christian

education in such terms as these: "... a Christian philosophy of education must recognize a twofold objective: seeing clearly the primary necessity for leading youth first of all to personal commitment to Christ, it must at the same time accept responsibility for the nurture of those who are already committed." Or again, "... in the ideally Christian school the statement made of the early Church is an ever-present possibility: 'And the Lord added to their number day by day those who were being saved.'"

To call attention to this difference is not to disparage the report of the N.A.E. Committee. Many a Protestant among those to whom the argumentation is directed finds himself exactly in the situation of belonging to a church which is not doing its duty, and he will therefore welcome the opportunity to send his children to a school which will take over as its own primary responsibility the function of the church. Nor, emphatically, is a Christian school an institution existing simply alongside the church, indifferent to the matter of bringing youth to "personal commitment."

To say that we have Christian schools because the church (limiting ourselves to it) was doing its duty is rather to remind ourselves of the fact that our Christian schools arose because the church as it preached the Word was also teaching its members theology; because the church was interpreting the Word and teaching its members to interpret the Word with respect for the "analogia fidei"; because the church was teaching the organic unity and historic continuity and contemporary significance of the militant church through-

WHY CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS? — Continued

out history; because the church was teaching the doctrines of the Covenant and infant baptism; because the church was teaching the doctrine of election; because the church was theological as well as soteriological; because the church was teaching that the self to be saved is the self with all its world of interests and relations; because the church was giving its youth catechetical training; because the church was teaching young and old the challenge to live in the world as citizens of the Kingdom of our Lord; and because the church was teaching all this not as purely speculative abstractions, but, with full recognition of its own imperfection, was teaching it as a living mind, the mind of the Scriptures, the mind of Christ.

In such a context our Christian schools arose; and, it would seem, would arise inevitably. But arising in such a context, the nature of the Christian school was also indicated. The Christian schools were "a Kingdom necessity." Christian education was not an interest simply of parents who have children that need schooling, but was an interest of all citizens of the Kingdom; an interest of all the citizens in the youth of the Kingdom; an interest analogous to the interest of the citizens of the United States in education for the youth of the United States.

And this interest was an interest not in mere schooling but in education. The aim of education was indeed to "integrate the Book of books with every area of human knowledge," though not without benefit of theology. The aim was indeed to make articulate for youth what it means to be a citizen of the Kingdom of our Lord, to be a citizen with all of himself. The aim was indeed "Christian nurture," if the subject of this nurture is viewed as citizen of the Kingdom.

Once more, to call attention to the difference in conception of the nature and necessity of Christian education is not to disparage the report of the N.A.E. Committee. Actually, too, in the Report both concepts of the nature of the Christian school are present, though the conflict between them is not faced. Nor does that which I have indicated as the concept traditionally prevailing among us rule out concern for "leading youth to personal commitment to Christ."

But the concepts are different. And the difference is of immediate and practical significance for us and our Christian education.

Our schools arose because the church was doing its duty. And our schools will continue as they arose only as the church continues to do its duty. As or if the church fails to teach doctrine (theology); fails to present the full counsel of God; fails to present the evangelical call to personal commitment or narrows its interest to that and no more; fails in catechetical training of its youth, or relies more and more on the typical Sunday school; fails to press home to its members their responsibility to live at home and in the world as citizens of the Kingdom; fails, by assuming that worldliness is to be confined to a spot here and a spot there; fails to develop a community of believers among whom love for Christ and therefore for each other is evident; fails to cultivate a sense of the significant work of the Holy Spirit, too, in guiding the church of all the ages, and hence a sense of the importance of creed and tradition; — if or as the church fails, our Christian school too will become a substitute for the church.

If our schools are to flourish and not become something else, the church must continue to do its duty; and its main duty is not simply to present an occasional sermon on the need for Christian education. Its primary obligation to our Christian schools is to be itself. Its primary obligation to our Christian schools is discharged when the church discharges its own duty as church.

That is on the side of the church. But there is another side, the side of our thinking as educators, the side of our thinking about Christian schools, why we have them and what their aim. For not only is the mind of American democracy (its emphasis on schooling rather than on education, for example) influencing us; the mind with which we think about Christian education is also being patterned unconsciously by the contexts of evangelical American Protestantism. And to the extent that this latter is true, we are not only subject to confusion in our thinking about the Christian school, but eventually our Christian school will make way for a school that attempts to *take over* the work of church. And this would mean that we had lost both church and school.

It is possible to speak about God's Providence only on the basis of the blood of the cross. Otherwise we will certainly fall into one of many possible arbitrary interpretations of history. Whim is excluded by redemption. Only faith furnishes the foundation for a vision of history's significance. That is to say, there can be no place for intuition alongside of faith and apart from the word of revelation. All events are embraced in the one work of God, which is explained for all time by His Word. Thus, there can be no proceeding from facts or events isolated from that revelation. He who sees things this way will never succumb to the temptation to identify prosperity with blessing and adversity with curse. In faith, however, one can accept prosperity as the gift of God and adversity as God's hand graciously leading him to greater faith.

All this touches on the life of a society or nation as well as on individual lives. If the faith of a people is real, and the Church more than a fallen power, the thankfulness for prosperity is more than a selfish interpretation of Providence. There can be a meaningful "Thou has set us free." There can also be a jubilation that construes God's favor from a neutral fact, apart from faith and apart from "the service of the Lord." The success of the Normandy invasion of 1944, in and by itself, does not prove a special favorable disposition in God toward the West European people any more than the liberation of Stalingrad, in and by itself, proves a special disposition in God toward the Russian people. The Providence of God included West and East, but everything depends, for both, on how the facts are understood. In the absence of true faith, liberation can be turned against a people, as Israel's resting its case for expected blessings on the mere fact of the exodus was turned against her. God's way with the world cannot be summarized with charts or statistics. Each of His acts, and His gifts, is charged with a new summons to obedience and new reminders of responsibility. Therefore the era after a liberation is as critical for a people, for East and West, as the oppression itself. We have seen shadows. Deeper shadows still can fall when after liberation the liberated people estrange themselves further from the service of God.

— G. C. Berkouwer in *THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1952

Founding the Indigenous Church

By HARRY R. BOER

THE Synod of 1950 has been called a Mission Synod. There is reason for this designation for the Synod concerned itself more than ordinarily with mission matters. It expanded the missionary program of the denomination by adding to its field in Nigeria and by assuming missionary responsibilities in India, Indonesia, and Japan. It addressed itself also, and very especially, to the question of mission policy. The problem posed by the policies followed in our Navaho and Zuni mission work had again been raised and had led to the submission of several overtures. A committee of the Board had prepared a study looking to the establishing of a more indigenous basis for mission work. The Board itself had prepared a tentative program looking in the same direction. All these matters were on the table of Synod. This synodical concern with missionary program and policy initiated a period of renewed activity, thought and interest in the missionary task of our denomination and of the Church at large.

The question of policy was the most difficult of resolution of the several problems that Synod faced. It did not feel ready to make any final decisions or recommendations and appointed a committee to study the entire question and report to the Synod of 1952. This committee, known as the Mission Policy Study Committee, consists of the Rev. John Gritter, Chairman, the Rev. H. Petroelje, Secretary, the Revs. A. H. Smit, H. Evenhouse, J. Van Bruggen, H. Boer, and Mr. H. Bratt. Its mandate, briefly worded but comprehensive in scope, reads as follows:

1) To formulate the principles of indigenous mission work based on a thorough exegetical study of all relevant Scripture passages; and in the light of our distinctively Reformed doctrines of church, covenant, etc.

2) To formulate the regulations governing the application of such principles to the Church and her Board; the Church and her missionaries; the Church and her duties to the native population, with special reference to finances, educational institutions and medical work on the mission field; and the Church and her obligations to the native converts;

3) To formulate the specific appli-

cation of these principles and regulations to the Indian Mission Field.

The committee has met regularly since July, 1950, at three month intervals. No meeting except the first lasted less than two days, and some as long as three and a half. The members worked hard at the meetings and frequently between meetings as is evidenced by the long studies that were submitted for analysis and discussion. All the sessions were conducted in a fine spirit of cordiality and endeavor to achieve unity of mind. That one section of its report is divided into a majority and minority is not because the members have not seriously tried to understand each other's point of view. As it is, there is a large and happy unanimity on very important matters.

The committee is not yet finished with its work. The report it is now submitting to Synod refers only to the first part of the mandate. A supplementary report on other questions may be presented to the Synod, depending on progress at future meetings with respect to matters under study. It is unfortunate that more could not be done than has been done. But when it is considered how large were the problems, how divergent the views held with regard to some of them, and how large the area of agreement to which the committee has come in the important area of principles, it will be admitted that considerable gains have been achieved. Moreover, the committee came gradually to see that a lot of time might be wasted by attempting to apply to concrete situations principles on which Synod had not yet expressed itself.

The report which the committee is now submitting consists of four parts: Historical Survey of the problem, Evangelism, Medicine, and Education. The report is a united report on all save the last section. Here the committee found no alternative to dividing into majority and minority sections. In the majority are the Revs. Gritter, Evenhouse, Smit and Van Bruggen; in the minority the Revs. Petroelje and Boer, and Mr. H. Bratt. In this article I would like to reflect on the section on Evangelism and at a later time discuss Medicine and the diverging viewpoints on Education. For the sake of brevity I shall not discuss the background giv-

en in the historical survey, helpful though it might be.

The Problem of Indigenization

THE report on Evangelism, although a united report, is by no means a timid report. It constitutes a forthright attempt to provide for the Church's direct missionary activity a statement of principles that will make for churches founded and rooted in their own Christian communities. The word "indigenous" means native to, rooted in. Its original meaning is "to be begotten from within." A plant, a tree, a custom, a society, an institution is indigenous when its roots are in the soil — material, social, or spiritual — in which and from which it must live. Christianity is, of course, always an "importation" in a certain sense. The Gospel is from above, not from man. But once it captures the heart of man it should find embodiment in forms that are natural to the society and culture in which the believer and the church with which he worships live. The Dutch psalms, German chorales, Gothic or Colonial Church architecture, particular forms of the religious press, Christian education, mercy and social activity, are all manifestations of indigenous Christianity among us of the West. As there are distinct types of American, Dutch, English, and other Christianity in which the national mood, mentality, and other characteristics come to expression, so it must be the striving of the missionary Church to bring into being churches that shall reflect the distinctiveness of character of the Nigerian, the Indian, the Chinese, the Indonesian.

How shall genuinely indigenous churches be brought into being? This is a difficult question and the committee has sincerely and at length struggled with it. We have tried to think in obedience to the Scriptures and to find in that Guide the norm for all our thinking. It was immediately obvious that the basic task of all missionary activity is a two-fold one: preach and teach the Gospel, and establish churches among believers. The first part of the task, that is, preaching and teaching, provides "the basic and unchanging forms of all missionary effort." This may seem obvious, and yet it is precisely here that one of the

FOUNDING THE INDIGENOUS CHURCH — Cont.

greatest issues in contemporary missionary thinking lies. The question is: *What constitutes preaching and teaching?*

What Is Preaching?

THE answer to this question has been obscured by what is called the "Comprehensive Approach." This method of conducting missions found its clearest expression at the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Conference, 1928. Its central thesis is: "... man is a unity and ... his spiritual life is indivisibly rooted in all his conditions — physical, mental, and social. We are therefore desirous that the program of missionary work among all peoples may be sufficiently comprehensive to serve the whole man in every aspect of his life and relationships" (Vol. VI, p. 245). There is sufficient truth in this thesis to make it an extremely dangerous one. It is very true that physical, mental, and social conditions *affect* the spiritual life. It is quite another matter to say that the spiritual life is *rooted* in them. If this be true, the changing of the physical, social, and mental environment would automatically create changes in the spiritual life. The adherents of the social gospel have, indeed, worked with this assumption by trying to create a Christian society through "Christianizing" the social order. Social uplift in its various forms was regarded as a "preaching" of the Gospel.

The Christian conception has always been that the renewal of man is from within, that it is an act of God, and then comes to expression in Christian thought and action that works regeneratingly on the environment. Of late, voices have been heard in Christian circles pleading for the introduction of the Comprehensive Approach in missionary methodology on a Christian basis. They wish to regard Christian education, mercy, rural reconstruction, socio-economic agencies as forms of preaching and teaching. The intention is to use these several instruments as means of effecting conversion while at the same time changing the environment in which the Christian must live. The general theological basis for this viewpoint is that the command to preach the Gospel has been given not to the Church as institute alone, but to the Church as organism also, that is, to believers in general.

The committee does not accept this view of preaching and teaching. It conceives of the New Testament idea of these activities as a direct oral or written transmission of the Gospel. To effect this purpose, radio, sound trucks, literacy programs, Bible schools may be used "but always the basic sense is to be narrowly adhered to." Missions will therefore also refrain from making the transmission of culture a conscious aim in their program. Western culture is one of the many milieus in which Christianity has come to live in the course of its history. It has itself helped materially to mold that culture, but the various expressions of it are certainly not to be identified with the Gospel and may not at all be suitable for the Oriental or the African. It is for the Church to plant the Gospel in foreign parts and then allow it to work as a leaven in the cultures of those areas. Then the Gospel will indeed be a transforming power and will prepare the coming of the day when each nation, tribe and tongue will bring its own peculiar treasures into the New Jerusalem.

Baptism and Church Organization

WHEN the Gospel is faithfully preached and God blesses this proclamation men will respond and believe. In these believers lies the basis for the organization and the extension of the young Church. The Committee emphasizes that believers must be impressed with the fact that they are called to be *witnessing* believers. This truth has not been adequately stressed in the past. It is also very urgent to prepare men to be pastors of the churches and teachers of the masses. For this reason the report recommends that "missionaries devoting their time exclusively to the training of nationals for evangelistic service should be set aside for this purpose in every area where such a step is feasible."

It is possible, however, that the policy of the mission with regard to accepting believers for baptism will be such as to restrain a healthy and vigorous growth of the developing church. In many mission areas the requirements for baptism are so high that sometimes years elapse before believers receive baptism. On the other hand, post-baptismal instruction and nurture

is often very inadequate. The report questions seriously the common practice of long delayed baptism. "It is plain that the New Testament example constitutes a sharp contrast to this practice. . . . One need only think of the three thousand baptized at Pentecost, of the Ethiopian eunuch, Lydia, the jailer, Cornelius." Admittedly there is a problem here. An uncritical external following of the New Testament example would greatly harm the cause we seek to serve. But what is basic as a condition for baptism is not knowledge of the Scriptures and of the doctrines of the church, but faith in Christ as Lord and Savior. The report acknowledges that a certain degree of knowledge is necessary for baptism. What it questions is whether the degree of knowledge to be required from the convert should be rather rigidly pre-determined. The sacraments of baptism and holy communion have been instituted to strengthen existing faith and the convert should be given the benefit of this added strength and grace at the earliest opportunity.

The major task in indoctrination the committee conceives of as coming *after* baptism. It is quite necessary that the missionary or the church inquire into the sincerity of the professed faith. But when faith seems genuinely to be there baptism should seal it, and continued preaching, indoctrination and participation at communion should strengthen it. This principle seems to be plainly taught by New Testament example.

Church organization should take place at the very earliest opportunity. This basic principle, too, is thoroughly scriptural. Precisely when it should take place and how many believers are required before it can be undertaken is difficult to say. But as soon as provision can be made for administration of the Word and sacraments and for the maintenance of discipline, the church should be constituted. What is all important here is the attitude of the missionary. If he desires to retain control as long as he possibly can, if he does not understand that the New Testament Church, wherever it exists, is mature and has the gift of the Spirit according to the measure of its need, then Church founding will be retarded, and with it the execution of Christ's mandate. It should be a missionary's highest joy to relinquish control of his sheep however much he may still be looked to for guidance and help.

The Young Church Fully Church

WHEN a church has thus come into being "there the true church of Christ exists and no amount of growth and development can make her more fully Church." When this is recognized, states the report, there will increasingly flow from this recognition the self-limitation of the sending church in all aspects of her dealings with the younger Church. They have become equals in dignity and authority. The former has no authority over the latter. To make this point concrete the report states that there is implied in this principle the fact that the eventual affiliation or non-affiliation of the younger Church with other Churches is ultimately her responsibility.

This position of the committee naturally raises the question whether the new Church can be "trusted" to make decisions of such a kind for herself. To this fear the report of the committee replies: "The great task of the missionary is so to labor that when the Church that comes into being as a result of his efforts reaches maturity, she will be so grounded in the truth and so yielded to the obedience of God's Word and the guidance of His Spirit, that she will in all her affairs act wisely and in accordance with the Reformed faith she confesses."

Because the young church is fully church it should assume the responsibilities of her coming of age. These are usually described as consisting of self-government, self-support and self-propagation. The first and the last have already been alluded to. The most difficult of achievement is undoubtedly the self-support of the young church. It may seem to be the least important of the three and it is sometimes so presented. When self-support is regarded merely as a matter of finances this is perhaps true. But this is a narrow and inadequate view. The question of self-support is essentially one of spiritual stewardship and responsibility. The Lord does not need our moneys, for the cattle on a thousand hills are his. But He is pleased to use our wealth, to further our spiritual life. The widow who cast her mite into the treasury was great in the Kingdom of heaven. A church that sacrifices for the support of its work will find in this self-sacrifice a source of spiritual strength that can be, very great indeed. History shows, too, that such churches are generally the most vigorous and alert. A

wise missionary and mission administration will give the most careful attention to this important opportunity to further the development of the younger church and her members.

There is another consideration favoring the idea of the greatest possible self-support. This consideration arises from the contemporary situation. It is never wise for a church to have her economic basis lying thousands of miles from her own community. But especially is it not wise when international tensions may cut off at any time communication between sending church and younger church. India offers a striking example of what happens to foreign supported native workers when aid from the foreign country is cut off. In 1923 the Indian Protestant native staff numbered 48,787. Thirteen years later, when the depression had taken its heavy toll, there were only 17,323. The cuts in budgets affected native staffs far more than white staffs. It is obvious that the indigenization of the Indian Church suffered a severe blow. The report of the committee does not state that under no circumstances should assistance be given. It lays down, rather, the working principle that "financial support of the younger churches by the sending churches should be held to the minimum compatible with their spiritual welfare, while their self-support should be the maximum allowed by their economic situation."

The Missionary Approach

IF the growing church is to be rooted in the life, culture and thought of its people the missionary should have a keen understanding of the people among whom he labors. On this score mission history abounds in instances of brilliant successes and dismal failures. The important principle underlying this question is that the preaching of the Gospel must speak to

the soul of the hearer. Here Jesus is our unsurpassed example. Intimately acquainted with the life of his people he drew on all circumstances of their life to bring home his message. The common people heard him gladly. Paul became all things to all men, he knew the religions of the people to whom he preached, spoke with philosophers in their own terms, was fully acquainted with the thought world of the Jew and the thought world of the Greek. Christ, the Sent One of the Father, fully identified himself with the humanity he came to redeem. So the missionary, sent by Christ as the Father had sent him, must do all he can to become one with those to whom he ministers.

The language, being the gateway to a people's soul, must be learned. So long as that gateway remains closed the missionary must forever stand as an alien outside, speaking from a distance. The missionary must master the means of communication. It can be done. It has been done a thousand times. Dr. Welmers' article in this issue strongly illustrates both the necessity and the possibility of achieving this end.

* * *

When the Church and its missionaries have done all they can to make effective their witness by careful thought, devotion and physical exertion, their efforts will still be unfruitful of any true achievement unless the Spirit of God bless what they have undertaken. Neither action, nor principles, nor sacrifice can be effective unless those who labor in the Lord and in the power of His Spirit. The committee therefore concludes its report by exhorting all who are engaged in the missionary enterprise to realize "the need for cultivating an understanding of the indispensability of the Spirit's blessing, an awareness of His illuminating, comforting and enabling presence, and of a life of prayer to remain at all times sensitive to His leading."

Letters to the Journal . . .

Prof. George Stob,
Dear Brother:

I have followed your series of articles on Divorce rather closely. I do not desire to debate the issue with you. However, the presentation of the history presented in the March issue of *The Reformed Journal* must be chal-

lenged on two grounds. The first is that you present the matter of the report which was presented in 1934. You make it appear that the church was "temporarily thrown off course by the surprising and quite anomalous happenings at the Synod of 1947. . . ." The fact is of course that this report

LETTERS TO THE JOURNAL — Continued

was rejected by a large majority of votes in 1934.

But the second ground on which I raise objection is of a more serious nature. Among the signers of that report you quote the name of our late Prof. D. H. Kromminga. That you had no right to do. I am sending you an article that appeared in *The Banner* of February 21, 1947, p. 253. In the interest of historical accuracy and out of respect for the memory of our sainted professor Kromminga you will no doubt be happy to publish his statement in your *Journal*. I quote:

"My name is attached to the Synodical Report on Divorce and Remarriage of 1932 and to the Majority Report on the same subject received by the Synod of 1934. As is well known, the latter report was rejected by that Synod by a large majority of votes. That being the case, my own attitude was one of watchful waiting, hoping that the Church would reach a satisfactory solution, conformable to Holy Scripture and contributing to the best interests of the Church and its members. It never occurred to me, that I had a duty of formally repudiating the Report to which I had attached my signature, either in toto or in part.

However, in recent years reports reach me from time to time to the effect that an unfair use is being made in some quarters of the fact that I at time signed that Report; such a use that virtually makes me stand up even today in maintenance of that Report in spite of all the arguments that have been passed to and fro on this subject since that time. In view of that fact I feel it my duty to break my silence and to do what I can to make such misuse of my signature of yore impossible for the future. Therefore I here publicly declare and inform the churches, that I do not wish to be held responsible for that Report in the sense of still occupying essentially its position on the question on which it speaks.

This declaration should not be understood to mean that I have gone over into the opposite camp. It does mean, however, that the Report of 1934 contains some elements, quite central to its argumentation, which I do now definitely repudiate. What I have in mind is specifically the position, that the Church should follow the lead of the Civil Governments, the Laws, and the Courts, in matters of divorce and remarriage, to the extent of allowing the Civil authorities the power of validating for Church life and for the conduct of Christians acts which are admittedly contrary to the Word of God. In 1934 our committee followed the lead of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, whose advice had been gained, in this matter and stretched it considerably beyond what that advice intended by applying it to our American situation, where the civil authorities are decidedly more lax in these matters than they were in the Netherlands. (Italics mine, C.H.)

Since those days two facts have become increasingly clearer to my mind. The one is the fact that the practices and rules obtaining in our civil life are so diverse and loose that it is impossible for the Church safely to allow the State to decide for it what is a valid though unbiblical divorce and remarriage.

The other is the fact that the growing divorce evil in our own circles shows clearly how great the danger is that threatens the Church if it does not define, and hold by, its own standards, derived from the Word of God, instead of in certain matters in this realm allowing the State to decide for it. In view of these facts I feel it incumbent upon myself, publicly to disown at least the relevant element in the Report that bears my signature."

Was signed — D. H. KROMMINGA

I am sure that you agree with me that the honor of our departed professor demands your retraction of the use of his name and the publication of this article.

Yours in the Lord,

C. Huissen,
Grand Rapids, Michigan,
March 10, 1952.

REPLY

I am happy to take note of the Rev. Huissen's letter and of the questions which he raises in connection with my article in the March issue of the *Journal*. And I welcome the opportunity to clear up the matters to which he makes reference.

There are three things in the letter of Rev. Huissen which call for comment.

1. The first is his statement that in the March issue of the *Journal* I "present the matter of the Report which was presented in 1934" (this was a Study Committee Report on Divorce to that Synod — S.)

It must be said, indeed, that I did not cite or "present the matter" of the Report of 1934 in my last article. Nor did I do so in any previous article.

This is worth noting because Rev. Huissen finds my use of the 1934 Report part evidence of my historical inaccuracies. It hardly seems right to find inaccuracies that are based on a report which I do not even present.

2. There is a second matter.

Rev. Huissen thinks I am in error in saying that in her development toward the position now proposed the Church was "momentarily thrown off course ... at the Synod of 1947." I am in error, he thinks, because the 1934 Report, which proposed that those who confess and repent of the sins of divorce and remarriage may be received into the Church, was rejected by a large majority of votes. Permit me the following observations:

a. My contention that our Church has been developing toward the position now proposed is based on the consideration that the "historic dissent" from our "historic position" has continued throughout the years. That "dissent" remained, notwithstanding the adverse decision of 1934, and gained strength after 1934.

b. A careful reading of the decisions of 1934 will show that this "dissent" was strong even in 1934, and exercised a large influence over the Synod of 1934. This is shown by the following facts: 1. The Synod of 1934 also refused to adopt the Minority proposal that the 1890-1908 position be reaffirmed, but chose rather to commit the Divorce problem to further study. (*Acts* 1934, p. 146) 2. The Synod of 1934 mandated its new Committee to consider in its study also the very report which had been rejected! (*Ibid*)

c. The decisions of 1936 give further and stronger support to the position of historic dissent." Note that: 1. The Synod of 1936 declared that the Synod of 1934, though not accepting all the conclusions of the Majority

Report (1934), did not reject them entirely. (*Acts* 1936, pp. 20, 21). 2. The Synod of 1936 decided in two concrete cases that persons who had shown true repentance of the sins of divorce and remarriage might be admitted to membership in our Church (*Acts* 1936, pp. 144, 145). This is precisely the position which for many years and now again is being proposed for adoption as our official position.

d. The Synod of 1947 was unique in that, in distinction from 1934 and other Synods, it did not merely reject a new position, but it adopted a position which was the old one made rigorous, though modified by certain "exceptions." 1947 was then presumed to be the finally definitive position which was to put an end to all the years of "historic dissent." It was for that reason that I spoke of 1947 throwing our development "momentarily ... off course." 3. There is a third matter in Rev. Huissen's letter.

Rev. Huissen thinks that I should not have cited the late Prof. Kromminga as one who took the stand that those who repent of the sins of divorce and remarriage may be received into the Church. Why not? Because Prof. Kromminga repudiated the 1934 report in a later published statement of his (which Rev. Huissen kindly supplies).

In this connection the following clear facts ought to be noted:

a. I did not cite Prof. Kromminga as a signer of the 1934 Report, anymore than of the 1930 and 1932 Reports (which he also signed). Nor did I cite Prof. Kromminga as being committed to the argumentation of the 1934 Report (to which I am not committed myself).

b. Prof. Kromminga did not repudiate the whole of the 1934 Report that bore his signature. He repudiated, as he clearly says in the statement which Rev. Huissen quotes "the relevant element," or "some elements ... specifically the position that the Church should follow the lead of the Civil Governments, the Laws, and the Courts, in matters of divorce and remarriage, to the extent of allowing the Civil authorities the power of validating for Church life and for the conduct of Christians acts which are admittedly contrary to the Word of God." (Italics mine — G.S.) I have joined Prof. Kromminga in the repudiation of such a position (cf. *The Reformed Journal*, Jan. 1952, p. 5), and couldn't possibly have cited him in support of it.

c. I did cite Prof. Kromminga as one of a large company of esteemed Reformed leaders — in our Church, in the Gereformeerde Kerken, and in the South African Church — who took the position that those who truly repent of the sins of divorce and remarriage may be received into the Church. Prof. Kromminga officially took that position in 1930 and 1932 as well as in 1934, and, as is very plain from the quotation offered by Rev. Huissen, he has never anywhere repudiated it. To the contrary, he expressly required that his "declaration should not be understood to mean that I have gone into the opposite camp." It would hardly be fair, therefore, to say that Prof. Kromminga repudiated the position to which he subscribed in 1930, 1932, 1934, and which he was at pains not to seem to repudiate, even while he repudiated some of the argumentation which in 1934 had been used in support of it.

* * *

I hope that this elucidation will help to resolve the questions which my last article occasioned in the mind of Rev. Huissen.

George Stob